

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

IN RE: CV SCIENCES, INC. SECURITIES
LITIGATION

Case No. 2:18-cv-01602-JAD-PAL

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER VACATING SCHEDULING
ORDER**

1 THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE TO THE FOLLOWING FACTS:

2 On November 28, 2018, the Court entered the Stipulation and Order Extending Time to
3 Respond to Complaint (Dkt. No. 25), pursuant to which the Court ordered that Lead Plaintiff
4 Richard Ina, Trustee for the Ina Family Trust (“Lead Plaintiff”) file his consolidated amended
5 complaint by January 4, 2019; that Defendants CV Sciences, Inc., Michael Mona, Jr., Joseph D.
6 Dowling, and Michael Mona, III (“Defendants”) file their motion to dismiss by March 5, 2019; that
7 Lead Plaintiff file his opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss by May 3, 2019; and that
8 Defendants file their reply in support of their motion to dismiss by June 3, 2019.

9 On January 4, 2019, Lead Plaintiff filed his Amended Class Action Complaint for Violation
10 of the Federal Securities Laws (the “Amended Complaint”) (Dkt. No. 30). On March 5, 2019,
11 Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 33) and related papers (Dkt. Nos. 34 and 35).
12 Pursuant to the Court’s Order (Dkt. No. 25), Lead Plaintiff’s opposition to the Motion to Dismiss
13 must be filed by May 3, 2019.

14 On April 25, 2019, United States Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen issued an Order (Dkt.
15 No. 39) (the “Scheduling Order”). The Scheduling Order set forth that “Pursuant to LR 26-1, the
16 parties were required to meet and/or confer as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) within thirty days
17 after the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared, and fourteen days thereafter to file a
18 mandatory stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. To date, the parties have not
19 complied.” Scheduling Order, Dkt. No. 39, p. 1. The Scheduling Order set forth various discovery
20 deadlines to govern this matter, including a requirement that the parties meet and confer no later
21 than May 9, 2019 and complete discovery by September 2, 2019.

22 This matter is a securities fraud case subject to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act
23 of 1995 (“PSLRA”). The PSLRA requires that “all discovery and other proceedings shall be
24 stayed during the pendency of any motion to dismiss, unless the court finds, upon the motion of
25 any party, that particularized discovery is necessary to preserve evidence or to prevent undue
26 prejudice to that party.” 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(3)(B) (emphasis added). “[T]he Ninth Circuit has
27 interpreted the automatic stay on all discovery under the PSLRA as applying not only when a
28 motion to dismiss is pending, but from the filing of the case until such time that ‘the court has

sustained the legal sufficiency of the complaint.” *In re Am. Funds Sec. Litig.*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1103, 1105 (C.D. Cal. 2007) (citing *SG Cowen Securities Corp. v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 189 F.3d 909, 911 (9th Cir. 1999)).

In the present matter, there is no dispute that the PSLRA governs. Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss on March 5, 2019 (Dkt. No. 33). Therefore, all discovery in this matter has been automatically stayed pursuant to the PSLRA, including any requirements set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and/or Local Rule 26-1. Lead Plaintiff has not moved to lift the stay of discovery. Therefore, the automatic stay remains in effect.

FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE, THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, this matter is subject to the provisions of the PSLRA;

WHEREAS, Defendants have filed their Motion to Dismiss, which remains pending;

WHEREAS, the Court entered the Scheduling Order on April 25, 2019 (Dkt. No. 39), setting forth a discovery plan and scheduling order dates that *inter alia* shall apply to discovery in this matter;

WHEREAS, the discovery contemplated in the Scheduling Order is subject to the automatic stay provision of the PSLRA;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by Lead Plaintiff and Defendants, through their undersigned counsel of record and subject to the approval of the Court, as follows:

1. The Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 39) is stayed.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

By: /s/ Richard Gonnello

Martin A. Muckleroy
State Bar #9634

MUCKLEROY LUNT, LLC

6077 S. Fort Apache Rd., Ste. 140
Las Vegas, NV 89148
Telephone: 702-907-0097

By: /s/ Eric Plourde

Terry A. Coffing
E-mail: tcoffing@maclaw.com
MAC Law
10001 W Park Run Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89135
Telephone: 702.942.2136
Facsimile: 702.856.8966

Facsimile: 702-938-4065
Email: martin@muckleroylunt.com

Richard W. Gonnello (*pro hac vice*)
Email: rgonnello@faruqilaw.com
Sherief Morsy (*pro hac vice*)
Email: smorsey@faruqilaw.com
Dillon J. Hagius (*pro hac vice*)
Email: dhagius@faruqilaw.com
FARUQI & FARUQI, LLP

685 Third Avenue, 26th Floor
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: 212-983-9330
Facsimile: 212-983-9331

*Attorneys for Lead Plaintiff Richard Ina, as
Trustee for the Ina Family Trust and Lead
Counsel for the Class*

S. Todd Neal (*pro hac vice*)
E-mail: todd.neal@procopio.com
Eric A. Plourde (*pro hac vice*)
E-mail: eric.plourde@procopio.com
**PROCOPIO, CORY,
HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP**
525 B Street, Suite 2200
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619.238.1900
Facsimile: 619.235.0398

*Attorneys for Defendants CV Sciences, Inc.,
Michael Mona, Jr., Joseph D. Dowling,
Michael Mona, III*

**PURSUANT TO THE PARTIES' STIPULATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED
THAT:**

1. The Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 39) is stayed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 2, 2019

 (signed)

Brenda Weksler (printed)

UNITED STATES (DISTRICT/MAGISTRATE) JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of April, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER VACATING SCHEDULING ORDER was served via the United States District Court CM/ECF system on all parties or persons requiring notice, and having access to the electronic filing system referenced.



Lori Gilmore, an Employee of
PROCOPIO CORY HARGREAVES
& SAVITCH LLP